

Define 'realpolitik'.

List three of the five conditions that Timmons says must be met to achieve *jus ad bellum*.

Describe three conditions that must be met by the killing of innocents in wartime for the action to be covered (i.e. ruled morally permissible) by the doctrine of double effect.

Distinguish preemptive wars from wars fought in self-defense.

Which right is more often in place according to Walzer: (a) the right of a nation's citizens to overthrow its tyrannical ruler, or (b) the right of foreign nations to invade a nation in order to depose its tyrannical ruler?

State two of Walzer's rules of disregard.

Define 'just war pacificism'.

State Sterba's definition of 'terrorism'.

What does Shue mean by a "condition of compliance"?

How might someone argue for the consistency of the following two positions: (a) killing a fetus is never justified; (b) capital punishment is a justified punishment for convicted murderers?

Define 'meta-ethics' and list three meta-ethical views.

Describe the purported obligation that we (in this course) have called 'perfect benevolence'.

What happened to Kitty Genovese? How does her tragedy challenge the view that we have no perfect positive duties?

How, according to Mill, can we test whether one sort of pleasure is qualitatively better than another?

Is 'terrorism is wrong' necessarily true? Is it analytically true? Explain why or why not.

What does it mean to say that terrorism is analytically *prima facie* wrong? If terrorism is analytically wrong, why might one be reluctant to: (a) deny the possibility of state terrorism and (b) deny that violence conducted by non-governmental organizations might be something other than terrorism?

Define 'supererogatory' and describe a supererogatory act.

Define 'perfect duty' and 'imperfect duty' and provide an example of each.

What questions does moral psychology address? List some positions in moral psychology and describe the answers they give to these questions.

Suppose one thinks: (a) that the best world possible is the world with more aggregate happiness than any other, (b) that people should decide what to do by following certain "ordinary" (lower-level) moral rules—such as "Don't cheat," "Don't kill," etc.—and (c) that people should perform those actions that produce the best world possible. What *empirical* claim must one then endorse on pain of inconsistency?

Distinguish *jus ad bellum* from *jus in bello*.

List two functions that a *first principle of morality* is supposed to have.

State Mill's principle of utility on the assumption that happiness is pleasure.

According to Mill, what population should we consider when we're trying to evaluate which of several available actions will maximize happiness?

Is terrorism ever morally permissible? If so, under what conditions and why? If not, why not? Is torture ever morally permissible? If so, under what conditions and why? If not, why not?

Some have claimed that there is no coherent, rational grounds on which to argue that the 9/11 attacks on the WTC and the Pentagon were acts of terrorism whereas the US's bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki at the end of WWII were not acts of terrorism. Do you agree with this claim? If so, explain why. If not, provide a definition of 'terrorism' that refutes the claim.

Describe what Dershowitz calls the "triangular conflict" in our thinking about torture. How is this conflict best resolved?

The exam will be held in class this Friday 10/31

The exam is worth 15% of your final grade.

(The papers are worth 30% each, and the final exam will make-up the final 25%.)

Bring a bluebook to the exam w/ nothing written on it.